

**REMARKS**

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner has identified two groups of claims. Group I includes claims 1 and 3-16; Group II includes claims 17 and 19-35. The Examiner's position regarding the grouping of the claims is that the two Groups are unrelated and distinct in that they have different modes of operation, based upon how the data table of the present invention is accessed.

Per MPEP §802.01, "[t]he term 'distinct' means that two or more subjects as disclosed are related ... AND ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER ..." (emphasis in original). While the data table is an important feature of the present invention, its storage location does not fundamentally alter the operation of the present invention. Applicant appreciates the fact that the storage location of the data table may place the present invention into two separate subclasses, but the present application only discloses a single invention and separate searches would not be required.

The main independent system claims (i.e., claims 1 and 21) disclose the same invention with different feature sets, and not distinct inventions. The preambles of the claims are identical, and independent claim 21 can be derived from a combination of independent claim 1 and dependent claim 7. Independent claim 21 contains most of the elements of independent claim 1, plus the cursor and activity menu, which are recited in dependent claim 7. Furthermore, dependent claims 11-

**Applicant:** Richard B. Himmelstein  
**Application No.:** 09/585,151

14 relate to a centralized database for storing information that is accessible by the system.

Claim 17 is a method claim that corresponds directly to the system recited in claim 1. The only other difference between these two claims is that claim 17 does not recite a storage location for the data table. Claim 19 is a method claim that is somewhat broader than claim 17 (compare the preamble and the beginning of the first clause of each of those claims).


Based upon the foregoing, all of the claims of the present application relate to a single invention, and the Restriction Requirement should therefore be withdrawn. In the event that this traverse is not successful and the Restriction Requirement is maintained, Applicant respectfully submits that the Restriction Requirement should be modified because the grouping of the claims is incorrect. Claim 20 depends from claim 5, yet these two claims are in different groups. Accordingly, Group I should include claims 1, 3-16, and 20 and Group II should include claims 17, 19, and 21-35. In such circumstances, Applicant would provisionally elect Group I.

**Applicant:** Richard B. Himmelstein  
**Application No.:** 09/585,151

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this matter, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at 215-568-6400.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard B. Himmelstein

By   
Steven J. Gelman  
Registration No. 41,034  
(215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

SJG/slp